

Goodling	Longley	Sanford
Gordon	Lucas	Sawyer
Goss	Luther	Saxton
Graham	Manzullo	Scarborough
Greenwood	Markey	Schaefer
Gunderson	Martini	Schiff
Gutknecht	McCarthy	Schumer
Hall (TX)	McCollum	Scott
Hancock	McCrery	Seastrand
Hansen	McDade	Sensenbrenner
Harman	McHale	Shadegg
Hastert	McHugh	Shaw
Hastings (WA)	McInnis	Shays
Hayes	McIntosh	Shuster
Hayworth	McKeon	Sisisky
Hefley	Menendez	Skeen
Heineman	Metcalfe	Smith (MI)
Heger	Meyers	Smith (NJ)
Hilleary	Mica	Smith (TX)
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)
Hoekstra	Minge	Solomon
Hoke	Molinari	Souder
Horn	Montgomery	Spence
Hostettler	Moorhead	Stearns
Houghton	Morella	Stenholm
Hunter	Murtha	Stockman
Hutchinson	Myers	Stump
Hyde	Myrick	Talent
Inglis	Nethercutt	Tanner
Istook	Neumann	Tate
Jacobs	Ney	Tauzin
Johnson (CT)	Norwood	Taylor (MS)
Johnson, Sam	Nussle	Taylor (NC)
Johnston	Ortiz	Tejeda
Jones	Oxley	Thomas
Kasich	Packard	Thornberry
Kelly	Parker	Thornton
Kildee	Paxon	Tiahrt
Kim	Petri	Torkildsen
King	Pickett	Torricelli
Kingston	Pombo	Traficant
Klecza	Porter	Upton
Klug	Portman	Vucanovich
Knollenberg	Poshard	Waldholtz
Kolbe	Pryce	Walker
LaFalce	Quillen	Walsh
LaHood	Quinn	Wamp
Largent	Radanovich	Watts (OK)
Latham	Rahall	Weldon (FL)
LaTourette	Ramstad	Weldon (PA)
Laughlin	Regula	Weller
Lazio	Riggs	White
Leach	Roberts	Whitfield
Lewis (CA)	Roemer	Wicker
Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher	Wilson
Lightfoot	Ros-Lehtinen	Wolf
Lincoln	Rose	Woolsey
Linder	Roth	Young (AK)
Lipinski	Roukema	Young (FL)
Livingston	Royce	Zeliff
LoBiondo	Salmon	Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—9

Becerra	Lantos	Rangel
Camp	Lewis (GA)	Rogers
Kaptur	Meek	Williams

□ 1425

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### REFERRAL OF H.R. 10, COMMON-SENSE LEGAL REFORM ACT, TO COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that title I, section 103 of H.R. 10, the Commonsense Legal Reform Act, be referred to the Committee on Commerce as an additional committee on jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 83 and rule

XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 7.

□ 1427

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to revitalize the national security of the United States, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. TORRICELLI] will be recognized for 30 minutes, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that we are beginning general debate of a very important segment of the Contract With America, H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act.

H.R. 7 confronts issues of real concern to the American people.

Take for example the issue of foreign command of U.S. Armed Forces in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

The Clinton administration broke new ground in this area. Indeed, few aspects of their foreign policy have been pursued with as much vigor as their efforts to promote U.N. peacekeeping operations in which U.S. forces have been placed under foreign command.

They did it in Somalia, they did it in the former Yugoslavia, and they were prepared to do it in Haiti.

H.R. 7 restores a proper balance with regard to foreign command of U.S. forces in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

H.R. 7 doesn't forbid foreign command in all cases; only in those cases where the President is unable to certify that the foreign command arrangement is necessary to protect U.S. national security interests and that the U.S. forces will not be required to comply with illegal or militarily imprudent orders.

The American people would be shocked to learn that the administration and its allies in Congress think the President should have a free hand to put U.S. forces under foreign command, even when it's not in our national interest and even when our forces could be compelled to obey illegal or militarily imprudent orders.

But that is the administration position, and today they will have time to defend it.

The exploding cost of U.N. peacekeeping operations is another matter

of concern to the American people that we address in H.R. 7. Last year, our total peacekeeping payment to the U.N. was almost \$1.1 billion. In addition, the Department of Defense incurred incremental costs of more than \$1.7 billion for U.S. support to or participation in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

That's a total of \$2.8 billion for peacekeeping.

H.R. 7 tries to get a handle on these spiraling costs. It insists that at least some of our unreimbursed Defense Department expenditures in support of peacekeeping be deducted from our U.N. assessment.

Critics of H.R. 7 say this is unreasonable. They accuse us of wanting to destroy U.N. peacekeeping.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Peacekeeping is an important tool that can serve our national interests. But because the U.S. taxpayer foots the largest share of the bill, we must ensure that it is only undertaken when it serves our interests and that it is carried out in a cost-effective way.

A final issue address by H.R. 7 is the expansion of NATO.

My efforts and those of my colleagues to facilitate the expansion of NATO—both in H.R. 7 and in the NATO Participation Act passed on the last day of the last Congress—are the final answer to those who claim that the Republican Party stands for a return to isolationism.

To the contrary, we favor continued American engagement in the world, and flexible policies in response to the changes brought about by the end of the cold war.

For these and other reasons, H.R. 7 is a good bill that deserves to be approved.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that we are beginning today to debate a very important element of the Contract With America, H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act.

In all probability our consideration of H.R. 7 will occasion a lively debate.

For too long the Congress has avoided debating some of the toughest foreign policy issues confronting our country. Last year, for example, those of us who wanted to debate President Clinton's plan to invade Haiti were muzzled until it was too late.

We're not going to avoid the tough issues any longer.

That's what H.R. 7 is all about. We're going to confront issues of real concern to the American people.

And it's our intention to turn around administration policy where it has been misguided, inept, or simply out of step with the wishes of the American people.

Take for example the issue of foreign command of U.S. Armed Forces in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

Before President Clinton took office, no President had ever put significant numbers of U.S. forces in a U.N. peacekeeping operation commanded by a foreign national.

The Clinton administration broke new ground in this area. Indeed, few aspects of their foreign policy have been